

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 312

SE 012 270

AUTHOR Kulp, Carrie C.
 TITLE Teachers Can Enhance Self Esteem in Children.
 PUB DATE 29 Mar 78
 NOTE 68p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Canada, March 27-31, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Achievement; *Affective Behavior; Change Strategies; Program Evaluation; *Self Concept; *Self Esteem; *Student Development; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Education; Teacher Seminars

ABSTRACT

Four treatment levels were compared to determine the effects of a seminar in self-concept theory and process education on teachers' classroom behavior and pupils' responses to that behavior. Goals of the program were to (1) determine whether an intensive focus on theories of self-concept and success would result in changed teacher attitudes and improved children's self-concept and relationships; (2) isolate factors producing this change; and (3) gather data for planning and designing teacher education programs. Eight hypotheses were formulated to determine the effect of selected independent variables on the following dependent variables: attitudes towards children and schoolwork, ability to facilitate growth of self-esteem in children, positive verbal behavior, verbal praise, student response to verbal praise, classroom cohesiveness, verbal criticism, percent of isolates in the classroom, child-inferred self-concept, child-perceived relationships with the teacher, and child sense of intellectual achievement responsibility. Significant differences on four variables (verbal praise, student response to praise, self-concept, sense of achievement responsibility) were found favoring experimental group I. These findings led to the conclusion that an inservice seminar incorporating theory, process education, and text was related to higher mean scores on variables of central importance to the study. Given the importance of personal and social development to the educational process, and the success met with during the six-week treatment, it was recommended that self-concept theory, research, and process education be included in both preservice and inservice teacher training. (MJB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED151312

TEACHERS CAN ENHANCE SELF ESTEEM IN CHILDREN

CARRIE C. KULP
WEST CHESTER STATE COLLEGE.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carrie C. Kulp

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

1978 AERA Annual Meeting
Division C, Section 2
Wednesday, March 29, 1978
Session Number 18.26

Printed in U.S.A.

INTRODUCTION

Many studies have shown the relationship between the child's self concept and his achievement in school, the pursuit of self esteem as a motivation for behavior, and the teacher's vital role in the development of the child's self concept. Teachers who are aware of how their behavior affects the self esteem of children and who have positive attitudes toward themselves and others will have a significant effect in enhancing the self esteem of their pupils. The education and well-being of children are so vitally affected by teacher attitudes and behavior that it is crucial for all teachers to be made aware of these facts.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of an inservice teacher seminar in self concept theory and enhancement of self esteem on selected teacher and pupil variables. Specifically, the question was whether or not the deliberate focusing of teacher attention for a period of six weeks on self concept theory, the relationship between the self concept and success in school, the teacher's role in the development of the child's self image, and specific processes by which teachers can enhance self esteem in children can significantly and positively affect teachers' attitudes and behaviors and children's self concepts and relationships.

In addition to the main question, the study attempted to determine what part or parts of the program of study produced the

most significant changes and the specific teacher and pupil variables most significantly affected.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Much research concentrates on dependent variables in the achievement areas where the most solidly developed measurement instruments exist, while the dependent variables in areas such as attitudes, interests, and sociometric concerns lose out due to the difficulty of measuring them. While achievement is vital, its level has been shown to depend directly on the child's ego involvement.

A child's regard for himself, his relationships with the other pupils, and the extent to which he feels he has some control over his own destiny are the variables most highly correlated with achievement. Coleman (1966) asserts that, taken alone, these attitudinal variables account for more of the variation in achievement than any other set of variables, i.e., all family background variables together, or all school variables together (p. 319). LaBenne and Greene (1969) declare that "empirical and experimental data demonstrate a direct relationship between the child's self concept and his manifest behavior, his perceptions, and academic performance (p. iv)."

Studies have shown that the development of the self concept is a product of the interactions of the child and his environment, particularly with the significant adults in his life. Teachers come in contact with the child when his self image is still malleable and before his view of self becomes resistant to

change. In fact, the teacher is one of the most significant adults in the child's life. The literature shows a persistent and positive relationship between the teacher's own self acceptance and his attitudes and behavior toward students. These attitudes and behaviors are as important to a child's success as the methods and materials the teacher uses.

Research to find out about the specific ways in which teachers communicate to children their attitudes and beliefs about them has made an important contribution to our knowledge. Recent studies have attempted to find out what part teachers play in the development of the self concept, whether or not teachers can change such self images if they try to do so, and how to distinguish between teachers in the frequency and kind of behaviors they use to enhance a child's self esteem. The success of such studies in answering these questions has greatly increased the need to communicate the information to the many teachers who are now engaged in teaching children.

It is not enough simply to know about the dynamics of the self concept as a motivation for behavior. The educator must implement theory in practice. Specific programs to achieve the goal of communicating to inservice teachers the important information regarding self theory and the processes of communicating positive attitudes and beliefs and providing an atmosphere in which self esteem can flourish are rare in the literature. All too few teacher preparation programs include process education of this nature.

Efforts to deal with the affective areas of the child's

development are not in conflict with effective strategies and methods for dealing with the cognitive domain. In fact, teaching methods can be adapted so that definite changes in the self concept will occur without injury to the academic program in the process (Purkey, 1970).

A reasonable conclusion, therefore, is that experimental research which focuses attention on the personal components of the teaching-learning situation may result in data indicative of ways to strengthen the conditions which contribute to optimal personal and academic development and diminish factors which contribute to lack of success in school and feelings of inadequacy and incompetence. Fox (1969) states that experimental evidence as to the functioning validity of a new program or plan is the most convincing data that such a program or theory has validity and relevance for educational practice (p. 458).

The main goal of the seminar program used in this experimental study was increased teacher sensitivity in responding to human needs in the classroom. The attempt was to translate theory into action by bringing the results of research into the classroom. The goal was to gather data to be used in planning and designing teacher education programs.

STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

Purkey (1970) states that when teachers convey their beliefs in an authentic and meaningful fashion and provide an atmosphere of challenge, freedom, respect, warmth, control, and success they will develop positive self images in their students and encourage

academic achievement. Teachers can learn effective ways of doing this. The following hypotheses for this study are based on conclusions from theory and research. The study attempted to find out what level or levels of the independent variable were most effective in making significant changes in the dependent variables and which of the dependent variables were most significantly affected.

1. On the six dependent variables of attitude toward children and school work, ability to facilitate the development of self esteem in children, positive verbal behavior, verbal praise, student response to verbal praise, and classroom cohesiveness, the teachers in experimental group I will have significantly higher mean scores than those in experimental groups II, III, and IV.

2. On the two dependent variables of verbal criticism and percent of isolates in the classroom, the teachers in experimental group I will have significantly lower mean scores than those in experimental groups II, III, and IV.

3. On the three dependent variables of inferred self concept, perceived relationship with the teacher, and sense of intellectual achievement responsibility, the children in experimental group I will have significantly higher mean scores than those in experimental groups II, III, and IV.

Not of major concern in the study but related to it are the following subordinate hypotheses:

1. The ability of all teachers in the sample to facilitate the development of self esteem, as indicated by scores on

the Principal's Rating Sheet: Facilitating Development of Self Esteem, will be positively correlated with the positive verbal behavior of all teachers in the sample, as indicated by scores on the Withall Categorization of Teacher Verbal Behavior.

2. There will be significantly more male than female stars in the whole sample.

3. There will be significantly more male than female isolates in the whole sample.

4. The mean grade level scores on positive perception of relationship with the teacher for all children in the sample will be significantly different, decreasing as children progress through the grades.

5. The mean grade level scores on sense of intellectual achievement responsibility for all children in the sample will be significantly different, increasing as children progress through the grades.

ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

For the purposes of the study, the equivalence of the experimental groups at the beginning of the experiment was assumed on the basis of random assignment. Teachers in each of the four experimental groups agreed to participate in the experiment. It was assumed that there was no bias from their being a voluntary group which would differentially affect the results of the study.

Comparability of conditions of administration of data gathering instruments was assumed. All measures on the 1,272 children in the experimental groups were administered by the

researcher. Interaction analyses of all forty-nine classrooms using the Flanders extended category system was done by the same rater. None of the teachers was observed by his own principal; both the Withall and the Principal's Rating Sheet were done by the same principal on each teacher.

The time period during which the seminars were held (at the close of the teaching day, from 3:30 to 5:40 p.m.) cannot be considered optimal in eliciting the most in teacher enthusiasm and interest. The results must be viewed in terms of this limitation. In addition, the period of six weeks was the maximum amount of uninterrupted time in the school calendars for the districts and the maximum which the districts chose to devote to the study. All data were gathered by the end of the six weeks' period. It is possible that much positive change in attitude and behavior occurred at a time subsequent to the six weeks' period.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

Teachers in eleven suburban elementary schools in southeastern Pennsylvania and northern Delaware, largely middle class neighborhoods, were invited to participate in the study. All teachers who responded were included in the seminars. The sample included forty-nine teachers and 1,272 children in their classes. Each of the forty-nine classrooms was a self-contained unit in which the teacher assumed major responsibility for the children throughout the school day. The classroom teacher in each case was the major influence on the children as far as time and extent of instruction were concerned. The teachers were assigned by

random selection procedures to the respective experimental groups.

The 1,272 children in the sample represented all five socioeconomic groups, as determined by the Hollingshead (1965) two-factor index of social position on a randomly selected ten percent of the children from each class. All of the children were in regular classes and represented the normal range of abilities.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The study was an attempt to assess the effects of an in-service teacher seminar based on concepts from self concept theory and research, with special reference to the strategies suggested by William Purkey (1970) and others.

The independent variable in this study was the seminar program. There were four levels or categories of the independent variable represented by four experimental groups, set up as follows:

Experimental Group I. This group received the entire treatment. They read the text (Purkey, 1970) and attended the six weeks of seminars, studying and participating in both theory and process education. In this group there were twelve teachers and 316 children.

Experimental Group II. This group received part of the treatment. They read the text and attended four weeks of seminars devoted to a study of theory of the self concept. In this group there were fourteen teachers and 354 children.

Experimental Group III. This group read the text and attended two weeks of seminars, studying and participating in the

process education part of the program. In this group there were ten teachers and 255 children.

Experimental Group IV. The teachers in this group were given the text at the beginning of the seminars. They read the text but did not attend any of the seminar sessions. In this group there were thirteen teachers and 347 children.

Table 1 shows the teacher-pupil distribution by experimental groups and grades. Table 2 shows the socioeconomic distribution of the children in the sample.

In accordance with the experimental design, testing of the experimental groups followed their exposure to the appropriate (assigned) parts of the experimental program.

There were eleven dependent variables in the experiment, eight of them relating to teacher attitudes and behavior and three to pupil attitudes and behavior. Figure 1 shows the variables, corresponding hypotheses, measuring instruments used, and predicted outcomes related to teachers. Figure 2 shows the variables, corresponding hypotheses, measuring instruments used, and predicted outcomes related to pupils.

In addition to the main hypotheses, five subordinate hypotheses were raised in this study which compared results without regard to experimental groups. The first of these subordinate hypotheses involved a correlational study of two measures taken on all of the forty-nine teachers in the sample. This study was undertaken in order to validate the Principal's Rating Sheet, developed by the experimenter for use in this study, by comparing results with an equal measure already validated by research. This

subordinate hypothesis is shown in Figure 1.

The other four subordinate hypotheses derive from theory and research on differences among children at age or grade levels and relate to main variables in the study. Comparisons were made of means by grade level for all children in the sample without regard to experimental groups. These four subordinate hypotheses are shown in Figure 2.

A posttest-only design was used, largely due to the nature of some of the instruments and the strong possibility that a pretest would act as a giveaway and/or allow time for reflection, thereby affecting results on the posttest on items related to the experimental treatment program (Campbell and Stanley, in Gage, 1963; Fox, 1969).

The first four seminar sessions were devoted to a thorough study of the theory of the self concept, its development, the relationship of self concept to academic performance and achievement, the importance to teachers of self understanding and acceptance and their influence on the development of self esteem in children. Numerous books on the self concept were read by the participants outside the sessions, and the seminar sessions centered on discussions of these readings. An attempt was made not to touch on the process education in these sessions.

The last two seminar sessions were devoted to intensive process education, focusing on strategies found to enhance self esteem in children and ways to convey positive beliefs about children in authentic and meaningful interactions. Examples of words and actions which promote as well as detract from this goal were

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP	TEACHERS						
	Male	Female	Gr.3	Gr.4	Gr.5	Gr.6	Total
I	2	10	3	2	3	4	12
II	4	10	6	4	2	2	14
III	1	9	1	4	5	0	10
IV	2	11	5	1	4	3	13
	9	40	15	11	14	9	49
CHILDREN							
I	151	165	82	48	84	102	316
II	170	184	138	102	56	58	354
III	129	126	27	96	132	0	255
IV	169	178	131	25	115	76	347
	619	653	378	271	387	236	1,272

TABLE 2
SES OF CHILDREN
IN SAMPLE.

School	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Total SES Sample	Total in Study
1	3	6	7	2	0	18	146
2	2	1	3	6	0	12	79
3	0	0	0	2	1	3	17
4	2	2	3	2	0	9	115
5	0	6	6	6	0	18	185
6	0	0	0	3	0	3	25
7	3	2	3	7	0	15	133
8	0	1	4	4	0	9	77
9	1	1	1	3	0	6	45
10	1	0	1	7	0	9	83
11	15	15	6	6	0	42	367
Total	27	34	34	48	1	144	1,272
New Haven Study (Hol- lingshead)	2.7%	9.8%	18.9%	48.2%	20.2%	99.8%	
This Study	18.7%	23.6%	23.6%	33.3%	.7%	99.9%	

Figure 1

Hypotheses, Measuring Instruments,
and Predicted Outcomes

CATEGORY	MEASURES ON TEACHERS			
	No.	Dependent Variable(s)	Measuring Instrument	Predicted Outcome
Main	1	Attitude toward children and school work Ability to facilitate dev. self esteem in pupils Positive verbal behavior Verbal praise Student Resp.to praise Classroom cohesiveness	MTAI Principal's Rating Sheet Withall Categor. Flanders Inter.Anal. Flanders Inter.Anal. Sociometric Nomin.	Group I higher
Main	2	Verbal criticism % Isolates in classroom	Flanders Inter. Anal. Sociometric Nomin.	Group I lower
Subordinate	1	Ability to facilitate dev. self esteem in pupils Positive verbal behavior	Principal's Rating Sheet Withall Categor.	Two dependent var. positively and signif. correlated

Figure 2

Hypotheses, Measuring Instruments,
and Predicted Outcomes

CATEGORY	MEASURES ON CHILDREN		
	No. Hyp.	Dependent Variable(s)	Predicted Outcome
Main	3	Inferred self concept Perceived rel.w.teacher Sense intellectual achiev- ment responsibility	Pupil Beh. Inven. Barrett-Lennard R.I. IAR Questionnaire Group I higher
Subordinate 2		Stars	Sociometric Nom. More male than female
Subordinate 3		Isolates	Sociometric Nom. More male than female
Subordinate 4		Perceived rel.w.teacher	Barrett-Lennard R.I. Diff. at each grade decr.gr.3 to gr.6
Subordinate 5		Sense intel. achievement responsibility	Intel.Achievement Responsib.Ques. Diff. at each grade incr.gr. 3 to gr.6

rehearsed. Strategies such as role playing, anecdotes, small group sessions and the like were used. Implications for specific teacher behavior were derived from the literature on how teachers can create a climate which is conducive to the development of positive self images in children.

All seminars for teachers were held from 3:30 to 5:40 in the afternoon. Seminars were held in four different locations on four different days of the week for four different groups, each group having in it teachers representing each of the experimental groups (for the appropriate sessions of the treatment). This was done to provide a control governing the possibility that the enthusiasm of the experimenter might be confined to one or another of the experimental groups. Neither teachers nor principals knew the composition of the various experimental groups. All sessions were conducted by the experimenter.

Eight instruments were chosen to measure the eleven variables. Two of these developed three measures each. The Flanders Extended Categories for Interaction Analysis was used to measure verbal praise, verbal criticism, and student response to praise. The sociometric nomination was used to measure the percent of isolates in each class, class cohesiveness, and the number of male and female stars. Each of the teachers responded to the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, Form A, and each was rated by a principal in the district (not his own) on the Principal's Rating Sheet: Facilitating Development of Self Esteem and the Withall Categorization of Teacher Verbal Behavior. Each teacher was rated on the Extended Categories for Interaction Analysis (Flanders) by

the same rater (not the experimenter) who used tapes made in the classrooms. No indication of experimental groups was given the rater. The children were measured by the Pupil Behavior Inventory, Revised Form, the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory - Adapted Form, and the Crandall-Katkovsky-Crandall IAR Scale. The teacher of each child filled in the Pupil Behavior Inventory, which is a device from which teachers may infer a child's self concept. The experimenter administered the sociometric nominations in each classroom and also the Barrett-Lennard and IAR Scale. Each item on the latter two instruments was read to each child (by classroom groups) in order to prevent invalid answers due to reading difficulties.

Copies of the measuring instruments, excluding the MTAI and sociogram, appear in the Appendix.

Data on all teachers and children converted to standard scores, and means for all experimental groups on each of the twelve measures were calculated. Analysis of variance, one-way classification, was used in the statistical treatment of the data. Although the main hypotheses compared experimental group I with the rest of the sample, it was a part of the design of the experiment that comparisons between all groups could be made to determine what level or levels of the treatment (independent variable) were most effective. For this purpose, the method of multiple comparisons using the F test (Scheffé) was used. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to measure the correlation between scores on the Withall and scores on the PRS ratings on all teachers in the sample, without regard to experimental groups. In

testing the significance of the difference between the number of male and the number of female stars and isolates which were observed in the study (without regard to experimental groups) and the theoretical frequencies expected, the statistic Chi Square was used.

Data were identified by number only. Each teacher and each pupil in the study was assigned a number, known only to the experimenter. All persons were assured that no data with names of persons would be collected by the experimenter. (One exception was the sociometric nomination, on which permission was asked for use of names in order for the teacher to effect room arrangements in line with sociometric choices.)

MAJOR FINDINGS

Hypothesis number one states that on the six dependent variables of attitude toward children and school work, ability to facilitate the development of self esteem in children, positive verbal behavior, verbal praise, student response to verbal praise, and classroom cohesiveness, the teachers in experimental Group I will have significantly higher mean scores than those in experimental groups II, III, and IV. Significant differences between means for groups favoring experimental group I were found on the variables of verbal praise and student response to verbal praise. (See Tables 3 and 4.)

Hypothesis number two states that on the two dependent variables of verbal criticism and percent of isolates in the classroom, the teachers in experimental group I will have significantly

lower mean scores than those in experimental groups II, III, and IV. No significant differences between groups were found. (See Table 4.)

Hypothesis number three states that on the three dependent variables of inferred self concept, perceived relationship with the teacher, and sense of intellectual achievement responsibility, the children in experimental group I will have significantly higher mean scores than those in experimental groups II, III, and IV. Significant differences between means for the groups were found on the variables of inferred self concept and sense of intellectual achievement responsibility. (See Table 5.)

Although on some of the variables in the study, the means of the other experimental groups exceeded (when prediction was that experimental group I would be higher) or were lower than (when prediction was that experimental group I would be lower) the mean of experimental group I, in no case was such a difference significant.

A high positive correlation (.73) was found to exist between the mean ability of all teachers in the sample to facilitate the development of self esteem in children (as indicated by scores on the Principal's Rating Sheet) and positive verbal behavior of all teachers in the sample (as indicated by scores on the Withall Categorization of Teacher Verbal Behavior).

Significantly more male than female stars were found in the whole sample (as measured by sociometric nominations). (See Table 9.)

The mean grade level scores on perceived relationship with the teacher (as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship

Inventory) for all children in the sample were found to be significantly different, consistently decreasing as children progress from grade three through grade six. (See Table 10.)

The mean grade level scores on sense of intellectual achievement responsibility (as measured on the IAR questionnaire) for all children in the sample were significantly different, increasing from grade three to grade six, though not consistently. (See Table 10.)

Although no hypothesis was raised by the study with regard to differences between boys and girls in self esteem, reference to the data shows that the boys tend to have less self esteem than girls at all grade levels (means are all lower). The greatest discrepancies are found to exist between seven-year-old boys (mean 68.41) and seven-year-old girls (mean 84.64). The discrepancy between eleven-year-old boys (mean 69.41) and eleven-year-old girls (mean 75.63) is the next highest.

The dependent variables which proved significantly different in favor of experimental group I were facets of behavior closely related to the goals of the seminars. Verbal behavior is considered to be amenable to measurement by a categorization system such as the Flanders system used in this study. The strong emphasis on praise in theory and process sessions may be reflected in the findings. The same is true for the variable of student response to praise, where all comparisons produced an F-ratio which was significant at the .01 level. Differences between the means of the experimental groups on the variable of self concept as inferred by the teacher from behavior of the child were also

significant at the .01 level. This may reflect more positive attitudes toward children on the part of teachers as well as more positive self images in children who were with teachers who made attempts to enhance self esteem.

The failure of the study to find significant differences between the means of the experimental groups on the variables of verbal criticism and percent of isolates in the classroom is not readily explained. Tapes were used to gather data, and it may be that the teachers were more aware of their verbal behavior when recording than under normal circumstances. The study did not find significant differences in number of isolates. It may be that teachers lack necessary knowledge and skill in group dynamics to effect changes of this nature. No such help was given in the seminars in a direct manner.

The lower mean scores for boys on self esteem, especially at ages seven and eleven, may relate to differences in maturation which are apparent between boys and girls at these levels. There may be some influence due to differences in academic performance among boys and girls in the elementary school, especially in relation to the tendency of parents to have higher aspirations for boys than for girls.

An analysis of the data on a composite of means on all measures for each experimental group shows the following with regard to what part or parts of the program of study produced the most significant results: in all cases where there were significant differences between means, the mean for experimental group I was in the predicted direction.

TABLE 3

MEANS OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS ON FIRST FOUR TEACHER-RELATED VARIABLES,
RESULTS OF ANOVA AND SCHEFFÉ TESTS

EXPER. GROUPS	MEANS			
	Attitude toward chil- dren & school work (Minn.Tch.Attit.Inven.)	Abil.facilitate dev.of self esteem in children (Prin. Rating Sheet)	Positive verbal behavior (Withall Categ.)	Verbal praise (Flanders Inter- action Analysis)
I	53.75	48.86	49.34	59.72
II	47.54	51.12	52.83	49.87
III	48.67	51.88	50.69	41.84
IV	50.21	48.36	47.13	47.44

F - RATIOS AND SIGNIFICANCE

All Groups	0.8996	0.3307	0.7552	9.6979*
I & II	0.825	0.105	0.260	3.224**
I & III	0.466	0.159	0.033	8.971*
I & IV	0.258	0.005	0.100	4.843*
II & III	0.025	0.011	0.088	1.936
II & IV	0.160	0.164	0.722	0.205
III & IV	0.045	0.224	0.236	0.911

*p = < .01

**p = < .05

TABLE 4

MEANS OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS ON LAST FOUR TEACHER-RELATED VARIABLES,
RESULTS OF ANOVA AND SCHEFFÉ TESTS

EXPER. GROUPS	MEANS			
	Verbal criticism (Flanders Inter- action Analysis)	Stud.response to praise (Flanders Inter- action Analysis)	Percent of isolates Sociometric Nomination	Cl.cohesiveness Sociogram
I	50.43	61.34	48.18	50.19
II	53.57	47.71	54.14	50.15
III	47.60	46.27	46.24	52.32
IV	47.60	44.88	50.09	47.86

F - RATIOS AND SIGNIFICANCE

All Groups	1.0431	11.5942*	1.4396	0.3654
I & II	0.212	6.641*	0.785	0.000
I & III	0.146	6.845*	0.070	0.079
I & IV	0.167	9.352*	0.078	0.109
II & III	0.693	0.066	1.244	0.088
II & IV	0.801	0.299	0.377	0.114
III & IV	0.000	0.061	0.287	0.360

*p = < .01

TABLE 5

MEANS OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS ON PUPIL-RELATED VARIABLES,
RESULTS OF ANOVA AND SCHEFFÉ TESTS

EXPER. GROUPS	MEANS		
	Inferred self concept (Pupil Behavior Inventory)	Perceived Relat.w.teacher (Barrett-Lennard Relation- ship Inventory)	Intel.achievement responsib. (Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire)
I	75.84	69.21	76.97
II	77.13	68.15	75.16
III	74.08	67.63	74.14
IV	71.90	67.77	74.21

F - RATIOS AND SIGNIFICANCE

All Groups	7.2209*	0.4157	3.6339**
I & II	0.378	0.164	1.234
I & III	0.595	0.308	2.536***
I & IV	3.483**	0.299	2.842**
II & III	1.876	0.035	0.343
II & IV	6.507*	0.022	0.357
III & IV	0.945	0.003	0.001

*p = < .01

**p = < .05

***p = < .10

TABLE 6
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ALL TEACHER-RELATED VARIABLES

VARIABLE/MEASURE	SS	df	BETWEEN	WITHIN	F-RATIO	P <
Attit.to chil.& school work (MTAI)	271.6 4528.0	3 and 45	90.521	100.622	0.8996	NS
Facil.dev. self esteem (PRS)	103.4 4691.7	"	34.479	104.260	0.3307	NS
Positive verbal behav. (WITHALL)	229.2 4552.4	"	76.396	101.164	0.7552	NS
Verbal praise (FLANDERS)	1884.4 2914.6	"	628.125	64.769	9.6979	.01
Verbal criticism (FLANDERS)	312.8 4497.3	"	104.250	99.939	1.0431	NS
Student response to praise (FLANDERS)	2097.3 2713.3	"	699.083	60.296	11.5942	.01
Percent of isolates in cl. (SOCIOMETRY)	420.4 4380.6	"	140.146	97.347	1.4396	NS
Classroom cohesive- ness (SOCIOGRAM)	114.1 4682.2	"	38.021	104.049	0.3654	NS

TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ALL PUPIL-RELATED VARIABLES

VARIABLE/MEASURE	SS	df	BETWEEN	WITHIN	F-RATIO	P <
Inferred self concept (Pupil Behavior Inventory)	5320.0 311398.0	3 and 1.268	1773.333	245.582	7.2209	.01
Perceived relationship with teacher (Barrett- Lennard Rel. Inventory)	477.0 484973.0	"	159.000	382.471	0.4157	NS
Intellectual achievement responsibility (Intel. Achievement Resp. Questionnaire)	1621.0 188542.0	"	540.333	148.692	3.6339	.05

TABLE 8
CRITICAL VALUES OF F
APPROPRIATE TO THE EXPERIMENT

COMPARISON GROUPS	MEASURES ON TEACHERS		
	.01	.05	.10
K = 4 N = 49 D.F. = 3 and 45	4.265	2.282	2.2175
	MEASURES ON PUPILS		
K = 4 N = 1,272 D.F. = 3 and 1,268	3.78	2.60	2.08

TABLE 9

CALCULATION OF CHI SQUARE IN COMPARING THE OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES
OF NUMBER OF MALE AND FEMALE STARS AND ISOLATES IN THE SAMPLE

SEX	STARS					
	O	E	O-E	$(O-E)^2$	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$	χ^2
MALE	66.24	54.56	+11.68	136.42	2.50	
FEMALE	42.88	54.56	-11.68	136.42	2.50	5.0*

ISOLATES						
MALE	116.32	106.4	+9.92	98.44	0.925	
FEMALE	96.48	106.4	-9.92	98.44	0.925	1.85

* $p = < .05$

Critical value χ^2 at .05 and 1 df = 3.84

TABLE 10

MEAN SCORES ON BARRETT-LENNARD RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY (BLRI) AND
INTELLECTUAL ACHIEVEMENT RESPONSIBILITY QUESTIONNAIRE (IAR)
BY GRADE LEVEL ON 1,272 CHILDREN

GRADE	MEASURES ON CHILDREN							
	BLRI	df	F	P <	IAR	df	F	P <
3	70.12				71.78			
4	67.09				76.06			
5	65.83				75.08			
6	63.53				77.50			
3 & 6		1/1,270	15.024	.01		1/1,270	28.737	.01
All Grades		3/1,268	5.591	.01		3/1,268	11.365	.01

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Under the conditions prevailing in this study and using the statistical method chosen for analyzing the data, significant differences between means for experimental group I and the other experimental groups were found on four of the eleven variables measured. These included teacher praise, student response to praise, inferred self concept, and sense of intellectual achievement responsibility. Although these were less than half of the variables measured they were, nevertheless, variables most relevant and important to the study.

These findings would lead to the conclusion that the in-service seminar which incorporated theory, process education, and reading of the text was associated with higher mean scores on the variables of central importance in the study. This indicates that a program combining the three parts may be more effective in achieving desired results than a program based on any one of them.

The finding of a significant correlation between positive verbal behavior and verbal praise supports the belief in the importance of positive verbal behavior, including praise, as a measure of classroom atmosphere and its amenability to categorization and measurement.

The findings support the generally existing belief that boys tend to predominate over girls in perceived leadership and peer prestige, and the generally existing beliefs and findings from other research that children tend to have less positive perceptions about their relationships with teachers as they progress through the grades, as well as that children tend to increase in their

sense of intellectual achievement responsibility as they progress through the grades.

It may be that attitudes toward boys as leaders and nominations that reflect higher status are the result of general attitudes toward males, discrimination in textbooks, and aspirations for boys held by teachers and parents.

The finding that boys tend to have less self esteem than girls at all grade levels points to the need for teachers to be more sensitive to the needs of the boys in their classes and to take into consideration that enhancement of self esteem may result in improved achievement.

Findings from this study as well as from other research indicate that children tend to have less positive perceptions of their relationships with the teacher as they progress through the grades. Teachers should be made aware of this fact, and more attention should be given to devising ways to improve teacher-pupil relationships.

Educational objectives universally contain references to the enhancement of personal and social development, though a dearth of specific instruction in techniques to implement them seems to exist. This study seems to indicate that even six weeks of intensive focus on theory, research, and process education can make a difference. Such education could be part of preservice as well as inservice programs for teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport, G. W. The ego in contemporary psychology. Psychological Review, 1943, 50, 451-468.
- Allport, G. W. Becoming. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1955.
- Allport, G. W. Pattern and growth in personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966.
- American Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development. Individualizing instruction. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1964.
- Amidon, E. J. Interaction analysis, recent developments. Paper read at the American Educational Research Association meeting, Chicago, 1966.
- Amidon, E. J., & Flanders, N. A. The role of the teacher in the classroom. Minneapolis: Association for Productive Teaching, 1967.
- Anastasi, A. Psychological testing. (3rd ed.) New York: Macmillan, 1968.
- Association for Student Teaching. Mental health and teacher education. Forty-sixth Yearbook. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1967.
- Avila, D. L., Combs, A. W., & Purkey, W. W. (Eds.) The helping relationship sourcebook. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.
- Bany, L. V., & Johnson, M. A. Classroom management: Theory and skill training. New York: Macmillan, 1970.
- Barker, R. G. Success and failure in the classroom. Progressive Education, 1942, 19, 221-224.
- Barclay, J. R. Effecting behavior change in the elementary classroom: An exploratory study. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 240-247.
- Barclay, J. R. Sociometric choices and teacher ratings as predictors of school dropouts. Journal of School Psychology, 1966, 4, 40-44. (a)

- Barclay, J. R. Sociometry: Rationale and technique for effecting behavior change in the elementary school. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 1067-1076. (b)
- Barrett-Lennard, G. T. Dimensions of therapist response as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs, 1962, 76, 1-36.
- Baum, M., Presley, J., Roberts, E., & Shotts, S. NDEA pilot guidance program: A progress report. Salem, Oregon: Board of Education, October 1, 1968. Mimeographed.
- Beatty, W. H. (Ed.) Improving educational assessment and an inventory of measures of affective behavior. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development, 1969.
- Beniskos, J. M. The person teacher. Education Digest, 1971, 37 (8), 34-36.
- Berman, L. M. New priorities in the curriculum. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1968.
- Bernard, H. Human development in western culture. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1962.
- Bertocci, P. A. The psychological self, the ego, and personality. Psychological Review, 1945, 52, 91-99.
- Borton, T. Reach, touch, and teach: Student concerns and process education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Boy, A. V., & Pine, G. J. Expanding the self: Personal growth for teachers. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1971.
- Bradford, L. P., Gibb, J. R., & Benne, K. D. (Eds.) T-group theory and laboratory method: Innovation in re-education. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Bradford, L. P., Gibb, J. R., & Lippitt, R. Explorations in human relations training. National Training Laboratory in Group Development. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1956.
- Branan, K. I get a very different feeling in that class . . . Education Digest, 1971, 37 (1), 9-11.
- Branden, N. The psychology of self-esteem. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.

- Brandt, R. M. The accuracy of self-estimate: A measure of self-concept reality. Genetic Psychological Monographs, 1958, 58, 55-100.
- Brookover, W. B., LePere, J. M., Hamachek, D. E., Thomas, S., & Erickson, E. L. Self-concept of ability and school achievement. II: Improving academic achievement through students' self-concept enhancement. United States Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 1636. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Office of Research and Publications, 1965.
- Brown, G. I. Human teaching for human learning: An introduction to confluent education. New York: Viking Press, 1971.
- Brownfain, J. Stability of the self-concept as a dimension of personality. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 597-606.
- Budzik, J. The realities of developing humanistic public schools. Education Digest, 1972, 37 (8), 22-24.
- Buswell, M. M. The relationship between the social structure of the classroom and the academic success of the pupils. Journal of Experimental Education, 1953, 22, 37-52.
- Calkins, M. W. The self in recent psychology. Psychological Bulletin, 1912, 9, 25-30.
- Campbell, J. D. Peer relations in childhood. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research, Vol. 1. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
- Chein, I. The awareness of self and the structure of the ego. Psychological Review, 1944, 51, 304-314.
- Coleman, J. S. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Health, Education, & Welfare, Office of Education, 1966.
- Combs, A. W. Perceiving, behaving, becoming. Yearbook ASCD. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1962.
- Combs, A. W. Intelligence from a perceptual point of view. In D. E. Hamachek (Ed.), The self in growth, teaching, and learning. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Combs, A. W., Avila, D. L., & Purkey, W. W. Helping relationships: Basic concepts for the helping professions. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.

- Combs, A. W., & Snygg, D. Individual behavior. (2nd ed.) New York: Harper & Row, 1959.
- Combs, A. W., & Soper, D. W. The self, its derivate terms, and research. Journal of Individual Psychology, 1957, 13, 135-145.
- Combs, A. W., Soper, D. W., & Courson, C. C. The measurement of self concept and self report. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1963, 23, 493-500.
- Cook, W. W., Leeds, C. H., & Callis, R. Minnesota teacher attitude inventory. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1951.
- Coopersmith, S. The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1967.
- Crandall, V. C., Katkovsky, W., & Crandall, V. Children's beliefs in their own control of reinforcements in intellectual-academic achievement situations. Child Development, 1965, 36, 91-109.
- Davidson, H. H., & Lang, G. Children's perceptions of their teachers' feelings toward them related to self-perception, school achievement, and behavior. Journal of Experimental Education, 1960, 29, 107-118.
- Diggory, J. C. Self-evaluation: Concepts and studies. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Dinkmeyer, D. C. Child development: The emerging self. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Dinkmeyer, D. C. Developing understanding of self and others manual. Circle Pines, Minn.: American Guidance Service, 1970.
- Doll, R. C., & Fleming, R. S. Children under pressure. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1966.
- Dreikurs, R. Psychology in the classroom: A manual for teachers. (2nd ed.) New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Durham, L., Gibb, J. R., & Knowles, E. S. A bibliography of research. In Explorations in human relations training and research, NTL series, Number 2. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1967.
- Elkind, D. A sympathetic understanding of the child six to sixteen. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.

- Engel, M. The stability of the self-concept in adolescence. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 51-59.
- Eriksen, C. W. Defense against ego-threat in memory and perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 230-235.
- Eriksen, C. W. Psychological defenses and "ego-strength" in the recall of completed and incompleting tasks. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 45-50.
- Erikson, E. H. Growth and crises of the healthy personality. In C. Kluckhohn, H. A. Murray, & D. Schneider (Eds.), Personality in nature, society, and culture. (2nd ed.) New York: Knopf, 1953.
- Flanders, N. A. Diagnosing and utilizing social structures in classroom learning. In The dynamics of instructional groups, Fifty-ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: NSSE, 1960.
- Flanders, N. A. Analyzing teacher behavior as part of the teaching-learning process. Educational Leadership, 1961, 19, 173-180.
- Flanders, N. A., & Havumaki, S. The effect of teacher-pupil contacts involving praise on the sociometric choices of students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1960, 51 (2), 65-68.
- Foshay, A. W. Curriculum design for a humane school. Education Digest, 1972, 37 (7), 24-27.
- Fox, D. J. The research process in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.
- Freud, A. The ego and the mechanisms of defence. (Trans. C. Baines from Das Ich und die Abwehrmechanismen, 1936). London: Hogarth, 1937.
- Freud, S. The ego and the id. (Trans. J. Riviere from Das Ich und Das Es, 1923). London: Hogarth, 1927.
- Fronidizi, R. The nature of the self: A functional interpretation. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Gage, N. L. (Ed.) Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Gibby, R. G., Sr., & Gibby, R. G., Jr. The effects of stress resulting from academic failure. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23, 35-37.

- Gnagey, W. J. The psychology of discipline in the classroom. New York: Macmillan, 1968.
- Goble, F. The third force: The psychology of Abraham Maslow. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1970.
- Goldhammer, R., Clinical Supervision. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.
- Goldstein, K. The organism. New York: American Book, 1939.
- Goldstein, K. Human nature in the light of psychopathology. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940.
- Goodall, K. Tie line: A dillar, a dollar, a traumatized scholar. Psychology Today, May 1972, 18-20.
- Goulet, R. R. (Ed.) Educational change: The reality and the promise. New York: Citation Press, 1968.
- Greenberg, S. B. Selected studies of classroom teaching: A comparative analysis. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook, 1970.
- Greer, M., & Rubinstein, B. Will the real teacher please stand up? A primer in humanistic education. Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear, 1972.
- Gregory, S. C. L. Self-concept in the school situation. Catholic School Journal, 1966, 66, 53-55.
- Guskin, A. E., & Guskin, S. L. A social psychology of education. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970.
- Guthrie, J. W. A survey of school effectiveness studies. In Do Teachers Make a Difference?: A report on recent research on pupil achievement. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Health, Education, & Welfare, Office of Education, 1970.
- Hall, K. E. The effects of a teacher-led guidance program on selected personal and interpersonal variables among fourth grade pupils. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1972.
- Hallowell, A. I. Behavioral evolution and the emergence of the self. In Evolution and anthropology: A centennial appraisal. Washington, D. C.: Anthropological Society of Washington, 1959.

- Hamachek, D. E. (Ed.) The self in growth, teaching, and learning. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Harrison, R. Problems in the design and interpretation of research on human relations training. In Explorations in human relations training and research. NTL series, Number 1. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1967.
- Hartmann, H. Comments on the psychoanalytic theory of the ego. Psychoanalytic Studies of the Child, 1950, 5, 74-95.
- Hartmann, H. Ego psychology and the problem of adaptation. (Trans. by D. Rappaport). New York: International University Press, 1958.
- Harvard Educational Review. Equal educational opportunity. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Hilgard, E. R. Human motives and the concept of the self. American Psychologist, 1949, 4, 374-382.
- Hirsch, J. G., & Costello, J. School achievers and under-achievers in an urban ghetto. Elementary School Journal, 1970, 71 (2), 78-85.
- Hollingshead, A. B., & Redlich, F. C. Social class and mental illness. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Hollingshead, A. B. Two factor index of social position. Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.: August B. Hollingshead, 1965.
- Hutchins, R. M. The learning society. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968.
- Inlow, G. M. The emergent in curriculum. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Iverson, M. A. & Reuder, M. E. Ego-involvement as an experimental variable. Psychological Reports, 1956, 2, 147-181.
- James, W. Principles of psychology. New York: Holt, 1890. 2 vols.
- Jennings, H. H. Sociometry in group relations. (Rev. ed.) Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1959.
- Jersild, A. T. In search of self. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1952.

- Jersild, A. T. When teachers face themselves. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute School of Experimentation, 1955.
- Jersild, A. T. The voice of the self. National Educational Association Journal, 1965, 54, 23-25.
- Josey, C. C. The self in the light of Gestalt psychology. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1935, 30, 47-56.
- Jourard, S. M. The transparent self: Self-disclosure and well-being. Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand, 1964.
- Kausler, D. H. A study of the relationship between ego-involvement and learning. Journal of Psychology, 1951, 32, 225-230.
- Klopf, G. J. & Bowman, G. W. Teacher education in a social context. New York: Mental Health Materials Center, 1966.
- Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. Taxonomy of educational objectives, Handbook II: Affective domain. New York: McKay, 1964.
- LaBenne, W. D., & Greene, B. I. Educational implications of self concept theory. Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear, 1969.
- Lane, H., & Beauchamp, M. Understanding human development. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1959.
- Lecky, P. Self-consistency: A theory of personality. New York: Island Press, 1945.
- Litwinski, L. Toward the reinstatement of the concept of the self. British Journal of Psychology, 1951, 42, 246-249.
- Long, N. J., Morse, W. C., & Newman, R. G. (Eds.) Conflict in the classroom: The education of emotionally disturbed children. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1965.
- Lundholm, H. The psychological self in the philosophies of Kohler and Sherrington. Psychological Review, 1946, 53, 119-131.
- MacDougall, R. The self and mental phenomena. Psychological Review, 1916, 23, 1-30.
- Mager, R. F. Developing attitude toward learning. Palo Alto, Calif.: Fearon Publishers, 1968.

- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.
- Maslow, A. H. Music education and peak experiences. Music Educators Journal, 1968.
- Massialas, B. G., & Zevin, J. Creative encounters in the classroom: Teaching and learning through discovery. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- McCall, R. J. Invested self-expression: A principle of human motivation. Psychological Review, 1963, 70, 289-303.
- McCandless, B. R. Children: Behavior and development. (2nd. ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.
- McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.
- Mead, G. H. Mind, self, and society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist. Ed. C. W. Morris, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Medinnus, G. R. An examination of several correlates of sociometric status. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1962, 101, 3-13.
- Medley, D. M., & Mitzel, H. E. Measuring classroom behavior by systematic observation. In N. L. Gage (Ed.) Handbook of research on teaching. A project of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Menninger, W. C. Self-understanding for teachers. National Educational Association Journal, 1953, 42, 331-333.
- Minnis, D. L. Micro-teaching and interaction analysis in a teacher education curriculum. Paper read at the American Educational Research Association meeting. Chicago, 1968.
- Minuchin, P., Biber, B., Shapiro, E., & Zimiles, H. The psychological impact of school experience. New York: Basic Books, 1969.
- Mitzel, H. E., & Rabinowitz, W. Assessing social-emotional climate in the classroom by Withall's technique. Psychological Monographs, 1953, 67 (18).

- Mood, A. M. Do teachers make a difference? In Do teachers make a difference? A report on recent research on pupil achievement. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Health, Education, & Welfare, Office of Education, 1970.
- Moreno, J. L., with Jennings, H. H. The sociometry reader. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960.
- Moreno, J. L. Who shall survive? Foundations of sociometry, group psychotherapy, and sociodrama. (2nd ed.) Beacon, N. Y.: Beacon House, 1953.
- Morrison, E. Underachievement among preadolescent boys considered in relationship to passive aggression. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60 (3), 168-172.
- Moustakas, C. E. (Ed.) The self: Explorations in personal growth. New York: Harper, 1956. (a)
- Moustakas, C. E. The teacher and the child: Personal interaction in the classroom. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956. (b)
- Moustakas, C. E. Self-explorations of teachers in a seminar in interpersonal relations, Journal of Individual Psychology, 1957, 13, 72-93.
- Moustakas, C. E. Basic approaches to mental health: A human relations seminar. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1959, 37, 343-349.
- Moustakas, C. E. The authentic teacher: Sensitivity and awareness in the classroom. Cambridge, Mass.: Howard A Doyle, 1966.
- Mussen, P. (Ed.) Handbook of research methods in child development. New York: Wiley, 1960.
- Ojemann, R. H., & Snider, B. C. The effect of a teaching program in behavior science on changes in behavior scores. Journal of Educational Research, 1964, 57, 255-260.
- Ojemann, R. H., & Wilkinson, F. R. The effect on pupil growth of an increase in teacher's understanding of pupil behavior. Journal of Experimental Education, 1939, 8, 143-147.
- Perkins, H. V. Changing perceptions of self. In D. E. Hamachek (Ed.), The self in growth, teaching, and learning. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

- Piaget, J. The construction of reality in the child. New York: Basic Books, 1954.
- Purkey, W. W. Self-concept and school achievement. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Purkey, W. W., Cage, B. N., & Graves, N. The development of a "pupil behavior inventory" to infer learner self concept. Paper presented at the annual convention of American Educational Research Association, New York, February 1971.
- Radke-Yarrow, M., Trager, H. G., & Davis, H. Social perceptions and attitudes of children. In D. E. Hamachek (Ed.), The self in growth, teaching, and learning. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Raimy, V. C. Self-reference in counseling interviews. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 12, 153-163.
- Rapaport, D. The theory of ego autonomy: A generalization. Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 1958, 22, 13-35.
- Remmers, H. H. Rating methods in research on teaching. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. A project of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Rich, J. M. Education and human values. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.
- Rogers, C. R. Some observations on the organization of personality. American Psychologist, 1947, 2, 358-368.
- Rogers, C. R. Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Rogers, C. R. Counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and practice. New York: Harper & Row, 1959.
- Rogers, C. R. Freedom to learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969.
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. Teacher expectations for the disadvantaged. Scientific American, 1968, 218, 19-23. (a)
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968. (b)

- Rothman, E. P. Needed: The teacher as a specialist in human relations. High School Journal, 1966, 49, 266-270.
- Sanford, N. Self and society: Social change and individual development. New York: Atherton Press, 1966. (a)
- Sanford, N. Ego process in learning. In J. Rosenblith & W. Allinsmith (Eds.), The causes of behavior II: Readings in child development and educational psychology, (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1966. (b)
- Sarbin, T. R. A preface to a psychological study of the self. Psychological Review, 1952, 54, 11-22.
- Sargent, S. S. Conceptions of role and ego in contemporary psychology. In J. H. Rohrer & M. Sherif (Eds.), Social psychology at the crossroads. New York: Harper, 1951, 355-370.
- Schmuck, R. A., & Schmuck, P. A. Group processes in the classroom. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1971.
- Sears, P. S. Levels of aspiration in academically successful and unsuccessful children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1940, 35, 498-536.
- Sears, P. S. Problems in the investigation of achievement and self-esteem motivation. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), Nebrasks symposium on motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1957.
- Sears, P. S., & Hilgard, E. R. The teacher's role in the motivation of the learner. In Theories of learning and instruction. Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: NSSE, 1964.
- Sears, P. S. & Sherman, V. S. In pursuit of self-esteem. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1964.
- Sherif, M., & Cantril, H. The psychology of ego-involvements. New York: Wiley, 1947.
- Snygg, D., & Combs, A. W. Individual behavior. New York: Harper, 1949.
- Spaulding, R. L. Achievement, creativity, and self concept correlates of teacher-pupil transactions in elementary schools. U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Report No. 1352. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1963.

- Staines, J. W. The self-picture as a factor in the classroom. In D. E. Hamachek (Ed.), The self in growth, teaching, and learning. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Stanley, J. C. Measurement of today's schools. (4th ed.) Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Stotland E., Thorley, S., Thomas, E., Cohen, A. R., & Zander A. The effects of group expectations and self-esteem upon self-evaluation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 15, 55-63.
- Sullivan, H. S. The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: W. W. Norton, 1953.
- Thompson, G. G. Children's groups. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of research methods in child development. New York: Wiley, 1960.
- Titchener, E. B. A note on consciousness of self. American Journal of Psychology, 1911, 22, 540-552.
- United States Department of Health, Education, & Welfare. Do teachers make a difference? Washington, D. C.: Office of Education, 1970.
- United States Department of Health, Education, & Welfare. Pacesetters in innovation fiscal year 1968. Washington, D. C.: Office of Education, 1968.
- Weinstein, G., & Fantini, M. D. (Eds.), Toward humanistic education: A curriculum of affect. New York: Praeger Publishers (for the Ford Foundation), 1970.
- White, R. W. Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 297-333.
- White, R. W. Ego and reality in psychoanalytic theory. Psychological Issues, 1963, 3 (Monograph 11).
- Willgoose, C. E. Mental health: At an early age. Instructor, October 1971, 58-59.
- Withall, J. The development of a technique for the measurement of social-emotional climate in classrooms. Journal of Experimental Education, 1949, 17, 347-361.
- Withall, J., & Lewis, W. W. Social interactions in the classroom. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. A project of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Wylie, R. C. The Self-concept: A critical survey of pertinent research literature. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1961.

APPENDIX

PRINCIPAL'S RATING SHEET
FACILITATING DEVELOPMENT OF SELF ESTEEM

According to research findings, a child's self esteem is closely related to his achievement in school. In addition, the teacher is an important factor in facilitating the development of self esteem. The classroom behaviors of teachers may be observed as to whether they convey positive beliefs in students and tend to create a favorable classroom climate for the development of self esteem. Please record observations of the following behaviors in either the category Noted or the category Not Noted (✓).

	<u>Noted</u>	<u>Not Noted</u>
CONVEYING BELIEFS IN AUTHENTIC AND MEANINGFUL FASHION:		
1. Behaving in a manner which is calm, accepting, supportive, facilitative (as opposed to threatening, grim, sarcastic)	_____	_____
2. Letting student know he is held in esteem (teacher is aware of and is interested in him as a unique person)	_____	_____
3. Conveying expectations and confidence that the student can accomplish work, can learn, and is competent	_____	_____
4. Providing well-defined standards and values, demands for competence, and guidance toward solutions to problems	_____	_____
5. Expressing faith in each child's ability. (The presence of open remarks which lead peers to believe in each other; the absence of remarks such as "Aren't you overconfident?" or "He'll never make it!")	_____	_____
6. Showing genuineness (rather than defensiveness and pretense). (Not having to be RIGHT; being able to admit not knowing or being wrong.)	_____	_____
7. Engaging in and/or arranging for private and semi-private communication with students. (This behavior relates to a characteristic of the teacher which seeks out a child to listen to his explanation or problem or to relieve his hurt or confusion.)	_____	_____

CREATING AN ATMOSPHERE OF FREEDOM, CHALLENGE,
RESPECT, WARMTH, CLASSROOM CONTROL, AND
SUCCESS EXPERIENCES:

Freedom and challenge

- | | <u>Noted</u> | <u>Not
Noted</u> |
|--|--------------|----------------------|
| 8. Encouraging students to try something new and to join in new activities | _____ | _____ |
| 9. Allowing students to have a voice in planning, and permitting them to help to make the rules they follow | _____ | _____ |
| 10. Permitting students to disagree with teacher opinion | _____ | _____ |
| 11. Teaching in an exciting and interesting manner. (This behavior connotes enthusiasm as opposed to "This has to be done, so let's get to it.") | _____ | _____ |
| 12. Distinguishing between students' classroom mistakes and their personal failure. (In the former, the teacher concentrates on the learning; in the latter on the student's being wrong, being a failure, not knowing.) | _____ | _____ |
| 13. Avoiding an atmosphere of competition in the classroom | _____ | _____ |

Respect and warmth

- | | | |
|---|-------|-------|
| 14. Learning the name of each student as soon as possible, and using that name often | _____ | _____ |
| 15. Sharing feelings (emotions and opinions) with students | _____ | _____ |
| 16. Practicing courtesy. (This teacher thinks of children as people, not as "just children.") | _____ | _____ |
| 17. Arranging time to talk quietly with students | _____ | _____ |
| 18. Spreading attention around and including each student, keeping special watch for the student who may need extra attention | _____ | _____ |
| 19. Noticing and commenting favorably on the things that are important to students | _____ | _____ |
| 20. Showing students who return after being absent that he is happy to have them back in class and that they were missed | _____ | _____ |

	<u>Noted</u>	<u>Not Noted</u>
<u>Classroom control</u>		
21. Remembering to see minor disciplinary problems as understandable and not as personal insults	_____	_____
22. Avoiding having favorites and victims	_____	_____
23. Having, and seeing to it that students have, a clear idea of what is and what is not acceptable in the classroom	_____	_____
24. Allowing students, within limits, to be active and natural. (The usual judgments with regard to freedom and responsibility apply here.)	_____	_____
25. Preparing adequately for class each day	_____	_____
26. Making it through the day without punishing students. (This refers to a loss of control which results in having to "take it out" on students.)	_____	_____
<u>Success experiences</u>		
27. Permitting students opportunity to make mistakes without penalty	_____	_____
28. Making generally positive comments on children's work (including written work)	_____	_____
29. Giving extra support and encouragement to slower students and guidance to superior ones	_____	_____
30. Recognizing the successes of students in terms of what they did earlier (improvements, rather than matching a rigid standard)	_____	_____
31. Taking special opportunities to praise students for their successes	_____	_____
32. Planning for honest experiences of success for students	_____	_____
33. Setting tasks which are, and which appear to the student to be, within his abilities	_____	_____

WITHALL CATEGORIZATION OF TEACHER VERBAL BEHAVIOR

Withall (1952) attempted to assess the classroom environment by rating teacher verbal behavior using the method of categorization of observations according to frequency of behaviors assigned to different categories. Following are the categories:

Category 1. Learner-supportive statements or questions. These are teacher-statements or questions that express agreement with ideas, actions or opinions of the learner, or that commend or reassure the learner. Agreement is frequently expressed by a monosyllabic response such as "Yes," "Right," "Uhuh," and the like. Commendation or reassurance may be stated in terms of (a) class accepted criteria or goals, or (b) the private goals and subjective criteria of the teacher.

The dominant intent of these statements or questions is to praise, encourage, or bolster the learner.

Category 2. Acceptant or clarifying statements of questions. These are teacher-statements of questions which (a) accept, i.e., evidence considerable understanding by the teacher of, or (b) clarify, i.e., restate clearly and succinctly in the teacher's words the ideational or the feeling content of the learner's statements.

The dominant intent of these teacher-responses is to help the learner gain insight into his problem, i.e., define his "real" problem and its solution in more operational terms.

Category 3. Problem-structuring statements or questions. Problem-structuring responses by the teacher offer facts or ideas or opinions to the learner about either (1) phenomena, or (2) procedures, in a non-threatening and objective manner. These responses contain no element of advising or recommending the adoption of certain ideas or procedures. Problem-structuring responses are frequently posed as questions which seek further information from the learner about the problem confronting him; or they may be statements which offer information to the learner about his problem. The learner is free to accept or to reject in part or in entirety the facts or opinions that are presented to him. Problem-structuring responses may be questions which the teacher asks either (a) to further increase his own understanding of what the learner has said or (b) to increase the precision of the learner's statement of the problem. Problem-structuring responses are problem-centered rather than either teacher- or learner-centered.

The dominant intent is to sustain the learner by facilitating his problem-solving activities.

Category 4. Statements evidencing no supportive intent. These statements are neither teacher-centered, nor learner-centered, nor problem-centered. They constitute a small percentage of the total teacher-responses. These responses include statements in which the teacher (a) questions himself aloud, (b) repeats verbatim a statement that the learner has just made, (c) uses a polite formality, (d) states an administrative or procedural detail such as "We'll meet in Room 25 tomorrow."

Category 5. Directive statements or questions. These are teacher-statements or questions which advise the learner regarding a course of action or his future behavior; they either narrowly limit his choice or offer no choice. These statements recommend to the learner the facts or procedures that the teacher proffers him. These statements or questions convey the impression to the learner that the teacher expects and hopes that he will follow her prompting and that she will approve if he does.

The dominant intent of these responses is to have the learner take up the teacher's point of view and pursue a course of action that she advocates.

Category 6. Reproving, disapproving, or disparaging statements or questions. By means of these statements a teacher may express complete or partial disapproval of the ideas, behavior and personality foibles of the learner. The teacher's internalized societal values largely enter into these responses. By means of these statements some teachers believe they are fulfilling their responsibility of inculcating in young people society's standards of acceptable behavior and achievement.

The dominant intent of these statements is (a) to represent to the learner societal values as the teacher perceives them, (b) to admonish the learner for unacceptable behavior and to deter him from repeating it in the future, (c) to impress on the learner the fact that he has not met the criteria for successful achievement which the teacher sets up.

Category 7. Teacher-supportive statements or questions. These are statements or questions in which the teacher refers to himself and expresses a defensive attitude, or refers to his present or past interests, activities, or possessions with the purpose of reassuring himself and of confirming his position or his ideas in the eyes of those around him.

The dominant intent of these teacher-responses is to assert, to defend or to justify the teacher. Statements in which the teacher perseverates on an idea, a belief or a suggestion fall into this category. By "perseverate" we mean a persisting in and a reiteration of an idea or opinion despite additional data which calls for a re-examination of the original idea or opinion.

WITHALL CATEGORIZATION OF TEACHER VERBAL BEHAVIOR
RATING SHEET

	Noted	Not Noted
<u>Category 1.</u> Learner-supportive statements or questions. Agreement with ideas, actions or opinions of the learner; commendation, reassurance of learner. Dominant intent: praise, encouragement, bolstering learner.		
<u>Category 2.</u> Acceptant or clarifying statements of questions. Teacher-statements of questions, accepting, showing understanding of, or clarifying, restating ideational or feeling content of learner's statements. Dominant intent: insight.		
<u>Category 3.</u> Problem-structuring statements or questions. Offering facts, ideas, opinions to learner, objectively, about phenomena, procedures. May be questions to find out more about learner's problem or statements giving information. No advice or judgment. Problem-centered content. Dominant intent: sustain learner by facilitating problem-solving activities.		
<u>Category 4.</u> Statements evidencing no supportive intent. Thinking aloud, repeating, formal language, procedural detail.		
<u>Category 5.</u> Directive statements or questions. Advice; may limit choice or offer none. Teacher expectations. Dominant intent: learner accept teacher's view and act on it.		
<u>Category 6.</u> Reproving, disapproving, disparaging statements or questions. Complete or partial disapproval of ideas, behavior, personality foibles of learner. Dominant intent: inculcate society's standards, admonish and warn of his failure to meet them, impress learner he has not met criteria for successful achievement.		
<u>Category 7.</u> Teacher-supportive statements or questions. Self-reference, defensive attitude. References to his own interests, activities, possessions; self-assurance. Dominant intent: assertion, defense, or justification of teacher; persistent clinging to own ideas, ignoring data which call for a re-examination of idea or opinion.		

EXTENDED CATEGORIES FOR INTERACTION ANALYSIS

Journal of Teacher Education Summer 1969

TEACHER TALK CATEGORIES	INDIRECT	Category 1 - acceptance and clarification of student feelings Category 2 - praise, verbal reward and encouragement of students Category 3 - acceptance and clarification of student ideas Category 4 - asking questions of the students
	DIRECT	Category 5 - giving substantive and procedural information Category 6 - answering student questions Category 7 - giving directions and commands to students Category 8 - criticizing or justifying authority to students Category 9 - giving corrective feedback to students
STUDENT TALK CATEGORIES		Category 10 - student talk in response to the teacher Category 11 - student talk emitted spontaneously by the student Category 12 - student questions teacher
OTHER		Category 13 - silence and confusion

PUPIL BEHAVIOR INVENTORY - REVISED FORM

Dr. William W. Purkey, Dr. Bob N. Cage, Mr. William Graves, University of Florida, January 1971

TEACHER FORM

This scale is to assist you, the teacher, in evaluating how the student perceives his or her "learner" self. Please select one of the following answers and record the number in the blank space.

NEVER: 0 VERY SELDOM: 1 ONCE IN AWHILE: 2 OCCASIONALLY: 3 FAIRLY OFTEN: 4 VERY OFTEN: 5

TEACHER NO. _____ STUDENT NO. _____ AGE _____ SEX _____

Compared with other students his age, does this student:

Relating	1.	get along with other students?	_____	
	2.	get along with the teacher?	_____	
	3.	keep calm when things go wrong?	_____	
	4.	say good things about his school?	_____	
	5.	tell the truth about his school work?	_____	_____
Asserting	6.	speak up for his own ideas?	_____	
	7.	offer to speak in front of the class?	_____	
	8.	offer to answer questions in class?	_____	
	9.	ask meaningful questions in class?	_____	
	10.	look people in the eye?	_____	
Investing	11.	talk to others about his school work?	_____	
	12.	join in school activities?	_____	_____
	13.	seek out new things to do in school on his own?	_____	
Accomplishing	14.	offer to do extra work in school?	_____	_____
	15.	finish his school work?	_____	
	16.	pay attention to class activities?	_____	
	17.	do his school work carefully?	_____	
	18.	read in class?	_____	_____
			TOTAL	_____

BARRETT-LENNARD RELATIONSHIP
INVENTORY (ADAPTED FORM)
(Form for Male Teacher)

Teacher No. ____ Student No. ____ My age is: ____ I am a : boy girl

- ___ 1. He treats me with respect.
- ___ 2. He is interested in how things look to me.
- ___ 3. He really likes me.
- ___ 4. He tries to understand how I feel about things.
- ___ 5. He isn't patient with me.
- ___ 6. He nearly always knows what I mean.
- ___ 7. He appreciates me.
- ___ 8. He seems to like me even when I misbehave.
- ___ 9. He just puts up with me.
- ___ 10. He wants me to think he likes me but he really doesn't.
- ___ 11. When I get angry with him, he gets angry at me.
- ___ 12. What he says is not what he really feels.
- ___ 13. He is friendly with me.
- ___ 14. No matter what I say he still likes me.
- ___ 15. When I'm good, he likes me; when I'm bad, he doesn't like me.
- ___ 16. I bother him.
- ___ 17. When I am upset, he gets upset too.
- ___ 18. We would get along better if he were more honest with me.
- ___ 19. He is truly interested in me.
- ___ 20. He likes me even when I say silly things.
- ___ 21. He doesn't give me a chance to explain myself.
- ___ 22. Even when others don't like me, he does.
- ___ 23. There are times when he hates me.
- ___ 24. He seems to know when I am bored or just not feeling good.
- ___ 25. He would like me better if I were different.
- ___ 26. He understands my words but not my feelings.
- ___ 27. When I'm near him, I feel comfortable.
- ___ 28. He seems bothered by some of the things I say.

BARRETT-LENNARD RELATIONSHIP
INVENTORY (ADAPTED FORM)
(Form for Female Teacher)

Teacher No. _____ Student No. _____ My age is: _____ I am a: boy girl

- ___ 1. She treats me with respect.
- ___ 2. She is interested in how things look to me.
- ___ 3. She really likes me.
- ___ 4. She tries to understand how I feel about things.
- ___ 5. She isn't patient with me.
- ___ 6. She nearly always knows what I mean.
- ___ 7. She appreciates me.
- ___ 8. She seems to like me even when I misbehave.
- ___ 9. She puts up with me.
- ___ 10. She wants me to think she likes me but she really doesn't.
- ___ 11. When I get angry with her, she gets angry at me.
- ___ 12. What she says is not what she really feels.
- ___ 13. She is friendly with me.
- ___ 14. No matter what I say she still likes me.
- ___ 15. When I'm good, she likes me; when I'm bad, she doesn't like me.
- ___ 16. I bother her.
- ___ 17. When I am upset, she gets upset too.
- ___ 18. We would get along better if she were more honest with me.
- ___ 19. She is truly interested in me.
- ___ 20. She likes me even when I say silly things.
- ___ 21. She doesn't give me a chance to explain myself.
- ___ 22. Even when others don't like me, she does.
- ___ 23. There are times when she hates me.
- ___ 24. She seems to know when I am bored or just not feeling good.
- ___ 25. She would like me better if I were different.
- ___ 26. She understands my words but not my feelings.
- ___ 27. When I'm near her, I feel comfortable.
- ___ 28. She seems bothered by some of the things I say.

INTELLECTUAL ACHIEVEMENT RESPONSIBILITY
QUESTIONNAIRE

Teacher No. _____ Student No. _____ Age _____ I am a: boy girl

There are 34 questions in this list for you to answer. For each of them, we would like you to check either the (a) or the (b) following the first part of the question. There are no right or wrong answers, and your answers will be used only to find out how children feel about certain things in school. No one will know what your answers are. We hope you will be thoughtful and honest in your responses. Thank you.

1. If a teacher passes you to the next grade, would it probably be
☐ a. because she liked you, or
☐ b. because of the work you did?
2. When you do well on a test at school, is it more likely to be
☐ a. because you studied for it, or
☐ b. because the test was especially easy?
3. When you have trouble understanding something in school, is it usually
☐ a. because the teacher didn't explain it clearly, or
☐ b. because you didn't listen carefully?
4. When you read a story and can't remember much of it, is it usually
☐ a. because the story wasn't well written, or
☐ b. because you weren't interested in the story?
5. Suppose your parents say you are doing well in school. Is this likely to happen
☐ a. because your school work is good, or
☐ b. because they are in a good mood?
6. Suppose you did better than usual in a subject at school. Would it probably happen
☐ a. because you tried harder, or
☐ b. because someone helped you?
7. When you lose at a game of cards or checkers, does it usually happen
☐ a. because the other player is good at the game, or
☐ b. because you don't play well?

8. Suppose a person doesn't think you are very bright or clever;
☐ a. can you make him change his mind if you try to, or
☐ b. are there some people who will think you're not very bright no matter what you do?
9. If you solve a puzzle quickly, is it
☐ a. because it wasn't a very hard puzzle, or
☐ b. because you worked on it carefully?
10. If a boy or girl tells you that you are dumb, is it more likely that they say that
☐ a. because they are mad at you, or
☐ b. because what you did really wasn't very bright?
11. Suppose you study to become a teacher, scientist, or doctor and you fail. Do you think this would happen
☐ a. because you didn't work hard enough, or
☐ b. because you needed some help, and other people didn't give it to you?
12. When you learn something quickly in school, is it usually
☐ a. because you paid close attention, or
☐ b. because the teacher explained it clearly?
13. If a teacher says to you, "Your work is fine," is it
☐ a. something teachers usually say to encourage pupils, or
☐ b. because you did a good job?
14. When you find it hard to work arithmetic or math problems at school, is it
☐ a. because you didn't study well enough before you tried them, or
☐ b. because the teacher gave problems that were too hard?
15. When you forget something you heard in class, is it
☐ a. because the teacher didn't explain it very well, or
☐ b. because you didn't try very hard to remember?
16. Suppose you weren't sure about the answer to a question your teacher asked you, but your answer turned out to be right. Is it likely to happen
☐ a. because she wasn't as particular as usual, or
☐ b. because you gave the best answer you could think of?
17. When you read a story and remember most of it, is it usually
☐ a. because you were interested in the story, or
☐ b. because the story was well written?
18. If your parents tell you you're acting silly and not thinking clearly, is it more likely to be
☐ a. because of something you did, or
☐ b. because they happen to be feeling cranky?

19. When you don't do well on a test at school, is it
a. because the test was especially hard, or
☐ b. because you didn't study for it?
20. When you win at a game of cards or checkers, does it happen
a. because you play real well, or
☐ b. because the other person doesn't play well?
21. If people think you're bright or clever, is it
a. because they happen to like you, or
☐ b. because you usually act that way?
22. If a teacher didn't pass you to the next grade, would it probably be
a. because she "had it in for you," or
☐ b. because your school work wasn't good enough?
23. Suppose you don't do as well as usual in a subject at school. Would this probably happen
a. because you weren't as careful as usual, or
☐ b. because somebody bothered you and kept you from working?
24. If a boy or girl tells you that you are bright, is it usually
a. because you thought up a good idea, or
☐ b. because they like you?
25. ~~Suppose you become~~ a famous teacher, scientist, or doctor. Do you think this would happen
a. because other people helped you when you needed it, or
☐ b. because you worked very hard?
26. Suppose your parents say you aren't doing well in your school work. Is this likely to happen more
a. because your work isn't very good, or
☐ b. because they are feeling cranky?
27. Suppose you are showing a friend how to play a game and he has trouble with it. Would that happen
a. because he wasn't able to understand how to play, or
☐ b. because you couldn't explain it well?
28. When you find it easy to work arithmetic or math problems at school, is it usually
a. because the teacher gave you especially easy problems, or
☐ b. because you studied your book well before you tried them?
29. When you remember something you heard in class, is it usually
a. because you tried hard to remember, or
☐ b. because the teacher explained it well?

30. If you can't work a puzzle, is it more likely to happen
a. because you are not especially good at working puzzles, or
☐ b. because the instructions weren't written clearly enough?
31. If your parents tell you that you are bright or clever, is it more likely
a. because they are feeling good, or
☐ b. because of something you did?
32. Suppose you are explaining how to play a game to a friend and he learns quickly. Would that happen more often
a. because you explained it well, or
☐ b. because he was able to understand it?
33. Suppose you're not sure about the answer to a question your teacher asks you and the answer you give turns out to be wrong. Is it likely to happen
a. because she was more particular than usual, or
☐ b. because you answered too quickly?
34. If a teacher says to you, "Try to do better," would it be
☐ a. because this is something she might say to get pupils to try harder, or
☐ b. because your work wasn't as good as usual?

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION



COURSE OFFERINGS FOR FALL 1974

EdE 501	Introduction to Graduate Study in Elementary Education	2	T	5:00
EdE 525	Curriculum and Research in the Language Arts	2	Y	5:00
EdE 530	Social Studies in Elementary Education	2	M	5:00
EdE 543	Creative Expression in the Elementary School	2	T	7:00
EdE 545	The Kindergarten-Primary Program	2	Y	7:00
EdE 547	Elementary School Curriculum	2	T	7:00
EdE 551	Child Development and Behavior I	3	W	7:00
EdE 553	Child Development and Behavior II (01)	3	M	7:00
EdE 553	Child Development and Behavior II (02)	3	M	7:00
EdE 560	Meeting Individual Needs of Children	2	W	5:00
EdE 561	Guidance in the Elementary School	3	W	7:00
EdE 590	Independent Study	1-3 TBA		
EdE 695	Seminar in Elementary Education	2	W	5:00

MANY OTHER COURSES ARE AVAILABLE IN OTHER DEPARTMENTS OF THE COLLEGE. WRITE FOR
A FALL CATALOG TO:

West Chester State College
Graduate Division
West Chester, Pa. 19380